

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RANDAL N. WIIDEMAN,)
)
 Plaintiff,) 3:09-cv-0650-LRH-VPC
) (Lead Case)
 vs.)

E.K. McDANIEL, *et al.*,)
)
 Defendants.)
 RANDAL N. WIIDEMAN,)
)
 Plaintiff,) 3:09-cv-0718-LRH-RAM

vs.)
)
 RICHARD ASHCRAFT, *et al.*,)
)
 Defendants.)
 RANDAL N. WIIDEMAN,)
)
 Plaintiff,) 3:09-cv-0729-RCJ-VPC

vs.)
)
 SERGEANT HUNT, *et al.*,)
)
 Defendants.)
 RANDAL N. WIIDEMAN,)
)
 Plaintiff,) 3:09-cv-0750-ECR-RAM

vs.)
)
 OFFICER HOMAN, *et al.*,)
)
 Defendants.)

1 Plaintiff Randal Wiideman filed a complaint in Nevada state court alleging violations of his
2 constitutional rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The complaint was removed to this court by defendants
3 on the basis of federal question jurisdiction. The case has been consolidated with various additional
4 cases related to the same set of facts (docket #9) and plaintiff has filed an amended complaint. The
5 amended complaint is subject to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and plaintiff has filed motions for
6 screening, which are unnecessary and redundant (dockets #12, #13, and #14). The motions shall be
7 denied on that basis.

8 The court shall screen the complaint in this action, but before doing so will allow the plaintiff
9 to file a second amended complaint addressing all claims he may have related to conflicts with the
10 prison mail regulations and staff, including any claims raised in other actions not yet consolidated
11 herein.¹ Plaintiff shall be given thirty (30) days to file his Second Amended Complaint as directed
12 herein and the amended complaint shall identify the case numbers of all cases he has previously filed
13 related to these claims which are being incorporated into this action. Failure to provide this information
14 may be considered reason for dismissal, as a failure to comply with the court's orders.

15 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that plaintiff's motions for screening (dockets #12, #13, and
16 #14) are **DENIED as redundant**.

17 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** plaintiff shall have thirty days to file a Second Amended
18 Complaint in conformance with this order.

19 DATED this 15th day of September, 2010.



LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

21
22
23
24
25
26 ¹ The court takes judicial notice of its docket, noting that plaintiff has filed complaints in at least
27 four other actions which present claims related to the issues set forth in this complaint. *See e.g.*,
28 Wiideman v. Peck, 3:10-cv-0024-HRH-RAM; Wiideman v. Skolnick, 3:10-cv-0224-ECR-VPC;
Wiideman v. Homan, 3:10-cv-0496-LRH-RAM; Wiideman v. Homan, 3:10-cv-0379-ECR-VPC.